

**REMARKS**

In response to the Final Office Action dated April 8, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20, 22-28, and 30-33 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated April 8, 2008, Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20, 22-28, and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20, 22-28, and 30-33 remain in this application with Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 amended. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

**I. Interview Summary**

Applicants thank Examiner Daniel for the courtesy of a telephone interview on June 24, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not anticipate or render obvious the claims as currently amended. Furthermore, the Applicants explained a wireless indication digit's operation and stated how the operation differs from the cited references. The Examiner indicated that the amendments overcome the cited references, but that further searching would be necessary. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

## II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated April 8, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20, 22-28, and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,963,864 ("*O'Neil*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,694,004 ("*Knoerle*"). Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "placing a first outgoing communication and a second outgoing communication in response to a determination that both the wired terminal and the wireless terminal are available, wherein the first outgoing communication comprises a wireless call indication digit appended to the first identifier, the wireless call indication digit indicating that the first outgoing call is to be routed via a second identifier associated with the wireless terminal, wherein the second identifier is not available to the means for placing the first outgoing communication and the second outgoing communication, and wherein the wireless call indication digit is operative to trigger a query to an associated database for the second identifier." Amended Claims 10, 18, and 26 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 17, lines 11-15.

Consistent with exemplary embodiments, a first call's intended destination from a service node (SN) may be a subscriber's wireless unit. (See specification page 17, lines 11-13.) However, because the SN may have data regarding a subscriber's

wireless directory number, the SN may send the first call to a central office (CO) switch with a wireless indicator. (See specification page 17, lines 13-15.)

In contrast, *O'Neil* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. For example, *O'Neil* merely discloses a services node receives a [wireline] number that was dialed by a caller. (See col. 20, lines 36-38.) If necessary, *O'Neil's* service node uses the wireline number in its programming to look up, in a table or internal database, a wireless number that is to serve as an extension to the wireline number. (See col. 20, lines 36-38.) Accordingly, *O'Neil* teaches away from appending a wireless indicator digit to a number associated with a subscriber. In addition, *O'Neil* does not disclose a wireless indicator digit being operative to initiate a query in an external database for a second identifier through which a call is to be routed. Rather, *O'Neil* discloses a direct search in an internal database based on a received wireline number.

Furthermore, *Knoerle* does not overcome *O'Neil's* deficiencies. *Knoerle* merely discloses that a service control point (SCP) modifies a redirecting party number by appending a code to indicate wireless line and secondary line quantities. (See col. 5, lines 38-41.) In *Knoerle*, if a subscriber has designated two different wireless lines and two other wirelines to receive simultaneous ringing, the SCP appends a code such as "23" to the redirecting party number field. (See col. 5, lines 38-41.) Like *O'Neil*, *Knoerle* does not disclose a wireless indicator digit being operative to initiate a query in an external database for a second identifier through which a call is to be routed. Rather, *Knoerle* merely discloses a counting method in which all designated secondary lines are sequentially called based on the appended code.

Combining *O'Neil* with *Knoerle* would not have led to the claimed subject matter because *O'Neil* and *Knoerle*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "placing a first outgoing communication and a second outgoing communication in response to a determination that both the wired terminal and the wireless terminal are available, wherein the first outgoing communication comprises a wireless call indication digit appended to the first identifier, the wireless call indication digit indicating that the first outgoing call is to be routed via a second identifier associated with the wireless terminal, wherein the second identifier is not available to the means for placing the first outgoing communication and the second outgoing communication, and wherein the wireless call indication digit is operative to trigger a query to an associated database for the second identifier," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 10, 18, and 26 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 are each patentably distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-12, 14-17, 19-20, 22-25, 27-28, and 30-33 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-12, 14-17, 19-20, 22-25, 27-28, and 30-33.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Final Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable claimed subject matter that was not addressed by the Examiner in the Final Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: August 8, 2008

---

D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

